



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,242	02/01/2002	Andrew Richard Wainwright	294-107 PCT/US	9497

7590

10/31/2006

Ronald J. Baron
Hoffmann & Baron
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, NY 11791

EXAMINER

BECKER, DREW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/936,242	Applicant(s) WAINWRIGHT ET AL.	
	Examiner Drew E. Becker	Art Unit 1761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/6/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 10/25/06 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-18 based upon Martines-Serna Villagran et al in view of Tallberg et al or Stahl, as set forth in the last Office action because: the declaration of Dr. Buwalda discusses only the primary reference by itself, rather than the combination of references relied upon in the previous rejection. The only mention of Tallberg et al and Stahl is to state that they do not include flakes and granules. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martines-Serna Villagran et al in view of Tallberg et al [Pat. No. 5,824,798]. Martines-Serna Villagran et al teaches a snack product comprising potato flakes (column 10, lines 15-28), normal potato flakes comprising about 73-81% amylopectin (column 6, line 50), the preferred potato flakes having an increased amylopectin content

Art Unit: 1761

produced by blanching and pre-conditioning (column 7, line 31), the potato flakes comprising 78% of the snack product (column 21, line 25), cereal flours and normal potato starches (column 10, lines 40-63), additives such as emulsifiers (column 11, line 65), the snack products being fried, baked, or extruded (column 10, lines 15-28), Saturna variety of potatoes (column 4, line 28), less than 5% reducing sugars (column 11, line 50), and oil (column 17, line 30). Martines-Serna Villagran et al do not recite potato starch with an amylopectin content of at least 95%. Tallberg et al teaches a potato comprising starch with an amylopectin content of 100% (claim 1; column 1, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the high amylopectin potato of Tallberg et al into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al since both are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already taught the use of any commercially available potato (column 4, line 24), since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already used starch with a higher amylopectin content of about 84% (column 7, line 31), since the 100% high amylopectin potato starch of Tallberg et al has not been subjected to chemical modification, making it more suitable as a food ingredient (column 1, lines 37-44), and since the potato of Tallberg et al would have eliminated the need for blanching and pre-conditioning in Martines-Serna Villagran et al. The combined product of Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Tallberg et al would have inherently provided increased expansion due to its higher amylopectin content.

4. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madines-Serna Villagran et al, in view of Tallberg et al, as applied above, and further in view of Jeffcoat et al [Pat. No. 6,541,060].

Art Unit: 1761

Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Tallberg et al teach the above mentioned components. Martines-serna Villagran et al and Tallberg et al do not recite less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch. Jeffcoat et al teach a food product comprising less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch (column 13, Example 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch of Jeffcoat et al into the invention of Madines-Serna Villagran et al, in view of Tallberg et al, since all are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already included many different types of starches (column 10, lines 39-63), and since pregelatinized waxy potato starch was commonly used in food products, as shown by Jeffcoat et al (column 13, Example 18).

5. Claims 1-9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martines-Serna Villagran et al in view of Stahl [Pat. No. 5,759,597]

Madines-Serna Villagran et al teaches a snack product comprising potato flakes (column 10, lines 15-28), the potato flakes comprising 78% of the snack product (column 21, line 25), normal potato flakes comprising about 73-81% amylopectin (column 6, line 50), the preferred potato flakes having an increased amylopectin content produced by blanching and pre-conditioning (column 7, line 31), cereal flours and normal potato starches (column 10, lines 40-63), additives such as emulsifiers (column 11, line 65), the snack products being fried, baked, or extruded (column 10, lines 15-28), Saturna variety of potatoes (column 4, line 28), less than 5% reducing sugars (column 11, line 50), and oil (column 17, line 30). Martines-Serna Villagran et al do not recite potato starch with an amylopectin content of at least 95%. Stahl teaches a food

Art Unit: 1761

product comprising potato starch with an amylopectin content of at least 95% (claims 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the high amylopectin potato starch of Stahl into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al since both are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already taught the use of any commercially available potato (column 4, line 24), since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already used starch with a higher amylopectin content of about 84% (column 7, line 31), since the 95% high amylopectin potato starch of Stahl has not been subjected to chemical modification, making it more suitable as a food ingredient, and since the potato of Stahl would have eliminated the need for blanching and pre-conditioning in Martines-Serna Villagran et al. The combined product of Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Stahl would have inherently provided increased expansion due to its higher amylopectin content.

6. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martines-Serna Villagran et al, in view of Stahl, as applied above, and further in view of Jeffcoat et al [Pat. No. 6,541,060].

Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Stahl teach the above mentioned components.

Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Stahl do not recite less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch. Jeffcoat et al teach a food product comprising less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch (column 13, Example 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch of Jeffcoat et al into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al, in view of Stahl, since all are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al

Art Unit: 1761

already included many different types of starches (column 10, lines 39-63), and since pregelatinized waxy potato starch was commonly used in food products, as shown by Jeffcoat et al (column 13, Example 18).

7. Claims 1-9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martines-Serna Villagran et al in view of Buwalda [Sheer Stability].

Martines-Serna Villagran et al teaches a snack product comprising potato flakes (column 10, lines 15-28), normal potato flakes comprising about 73-81% amylopectin (column 6, line 50), the preferred potato flakes having an increased amylopectin content produced by blanching and pre-conditioning (column 7, line 31), the potato flakes comprising 78% of the snack product (column 21, line 25), cereal flours and normal potato starches (column 10, lines 40-63), additives such as emulsifiers (column 11, line 65), the snack products being fried, baked, or extruded (column 10, lines 15-28), Saturna variety of potatoes (column 4, line 28), less than 5% reducing sugars (column 11, line 50), and oil (column 17, line 30). Martines-Serna Villagran et al do not recite potato starch with an amylopectin content of at least 95%. Buwalda teach a 100% amylopectin potato starch (Table 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the 100% amylopectin potato starch of Buwalda into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al since both are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already taught the use of any commercially available potato (column 4, line 24), since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already used starch with an increased amylopectin content (column 7, line 31), since the 100% amylopectin potato starch of Buwalda provides improved expansion properties in snack

Art Unit: 1761

foods (page 13, column 3, paragraph 1), and since the potato starch of Buwalda would have eliminated the need for blanching and pre-conditioning in Martines-Serna Villagran et al in order to increase the amylopectin content.

8. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martines-Serna Villagran et al, in view of Buwalda, as applied above, and further in view of Jeffcoat et al [Pat. No. 6,541,060].

Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Buwalda teach the above mentioned components. Martines-Serna Villagran et al and Buwalda do not recite less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch. Jeffcoat et al teach a food product comprising less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch (column 13, Example 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the less than 10% pregelatinized waxy potato starch of Jeffcoat et al into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al, in view of Buwalda, since all are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already included many different types of starches (column 10, lines 39-63), and since pregelatinized waxy potato starch was commonly used in food products, as shown by Jeffcoat et al (column 13, Example 18).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed August 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (in particular Martines-Serna Villagran et al), one cannot show nonobviousness by

Art Unit: 1761

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a lack of amylose) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Martines-Serna Villagran et al is directed to a snack food comprising potato flakes with above normal amylopectin content. Tallberg et al is directed to a type of potato with increased levels of

Art Unit: 1761

amylopectin. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the high amylopectin potato of Tallberg et al into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al since both are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already taught the use of any commercially available potato (column 4, line 24), since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already used starch with a higher amylopectin content of about 84% (column 7, line 31), since the 100% high amylopectin potato starch of Tallberg et al has not been subjected to chemical modification, making it more suitable as a food ingredient (column 1, lines 37-44), and since the potato of Tallberg et al would have eliminated the need for blanching and pre-conditioning in Martines-Serna Villagran et al.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Martines-Serna Villagran et al is directed to a snack food comprising potato flakes with above normal amylopectin content. Stahl is directed to a type of potato with increased levels of amylopectin. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the high amylopectin potato of Stahl into the invention of Martines-Serna Villagran et al since both are directed to food products, since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already


Art Unit: 1761

taught the use of any commercially available potato (column 4, line 24), since Martines-Serna Villagran et al already used starch with a higher amylopectin content of about 84% (column 7, line 31), since the 95% high amylopectin potato starch of Stahl has not been subjected to chemical modification, making it more suitable as a food ingredient (column 1, lines 37-44), and since the potato of Stahl would have eliminated the need for blanching and pre-conditioning in Martines-Serna Villagran et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


DREW BECKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/26/06